

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. IV, NO. 26

JULY 16, 1956



WASHINGTON, D. C.

15 CENTS

Capitol Doubts Ike, With Nixon, Can Now Beat Adlai

The Republicans hope to whip up a bandwagon psychology behind Eisenhower's announcement he will run again. But there is a new air of confidence around Democratic headquarters here in Washington. Privately the Republicans are far from being as sure as they sound in public. Newspaper correspondents and political analysts are beginning to doubt that Eisenhower, if he runs with Nixon, can now defeat Stevenson.

Reactions from home to Congressmen indicate the White House press staff and its medical entourage were too clever in their "better than ever" line. Few people can be expected to believe that Eisenhower's chances of surviving a second term have been improved by a heart attack and an ileitis operation. Silliest journalism of the week was David Lawrence's "third term" boom for Ike; presumably Lawrence expects one more serious illness to make the President "even more fit" by 1960.

The latest Roper poll, the day before the President's announcement, showed 7 percent less inclined to vote for Eisenhower since his operation; many elections have been lost on much less than 7 percent. It was a bad blow for the GOP when *Time's* medicine department (July 16) admitted insurance actuaries figure a heart attack cuts life expectancy at least one-third and that in half the ileitis cases there is a relapse in five years. Add to this the *Newsweek* survey (June 25) which

reported that Eisenhower's illness had tightened the presidential race in 30 States with 309 of the 531 electoral votes, and that "Nixon is the reason in 23 States," including his native California. (*Newsweek* must have leaned over backwards to be fair to Nixon because it listed New York as one State where Nixon's running would not be a factor!)

Those who know Knowland's warm dislike of Nixon guess that what really made him happy at Gettysburg was to be able to tell the reporters that the Vice Presidential nomination was not discussed. Officially the statement of April 26 still stands. Eisenhower was then "delighted" to hear that Nixon was willing to run with him. Nobody has had the temerity to ask whether he would be equally "delighted" if Nixon suddenly decided to take a year off and catch up on some of those good books he hasn't been reading lately. While Hagerty deadpans the Nixon question in public, White House aides in private have fed several newsmen the idea that maybe it would be logical if Sherman Adams—who has been doing most of the work anyway—were put into the No. 2 post, ready to step into Ike's shoes. Others hope all that foreign touring will make Nixon realize how much fun it would be to become Secretary of State, and be a big man like John Foster Dulles. These wistful day-dreams have made Nixon's friends apprehensive.

Bipartisan Pusillanimity

This is going to be a difficult election in which to make up one's mind. The bankruptcy of the better elements in both parties was demonstrated here again last week in the collapse of the Eisenhower forces and the Democratic leadership on the loyalty-security issue. The Supreme Court's decision in the Cole case and the report released by the New York Bar Association's special committee offered safe auspices for the beginnings of a return to sanity. The Court, speaking through an Eisenhower appointee, Harlan, and the Bar Association through a most respectable and non-controversial if not downright stuffy group of leading lawyers, would cut the security program down to 1,500,000 employees in sensitive agencies. But though the security mania has gone beyond all bounds and this is a chance to make a stand, neither party leadership has the courage. The Administration has knuckled under to the drive for the Walter bill in the House and the companion Eastland-Mundt-McCarthy measures in the Senate. These would blanket the entire Civil Service under the summary suspension procedure of the 1950 Act.

The rest of the Civil Service would still be subject to legislation which makes it a crime for a Communist to work or to seek employment in the government. The reason for the near-hysterical campaign of misrepresentation indulged in by the Civil Service Commission is that under the Cole decision em-

ployes in non-sensitive positions would have to be given some semblance of a hearing and statement of charges. Passage of the Walter-Eastland legislation would make it possible to fire anyone in the government without telling him why he was being fired. From a practical political point of view in this fetid atmosphere, the easiest way to block the Walter bill would be to support the Rees bill. This would reestablish a system of loyalty boards with some semblance of trial procedure for non-sensitive positions. But the "reactionary" Rees of Kansas has been unable to muster any support from the liberals in either the House or Senate, and the labor movement is too frightened or indifferent to take a hand. The Tennessee Democrat, Murray, who heads the House Post Office and Civil Service Commission is a bush league Eastland. The only hope is that the legislation may get lost in the rush before adjournment.

I read the full text of the Bar Association report in New York, and found it highly overrated and disappointing. Examined carefully the recommendations would still leave the accused employe with no rights of subpoena, defense or confrontation except those the hearing boards and the FBI choose to give him. The investigation made by the bar committee was cautious and superficial. This whole novel area of quasi-crime, dealing with the probability of future misconduct, a kind of

(Continued on Page Four)

How Sherman Adams Set Up Clio in A White House Hideaway . . .

I

Robert J. Donovan's "Eisenhower: The Inside Story" resembles those reports on the loyalty of Federal employees turned in by the FBI. It throws together the trivial and the momentous, the dubious and the true, without evaluation or perspective, in the prose style of an overworked investigator slapping it all down before he can be interrupted by a bank robbery. The Donovan report differs, however, in one respect from Washington's most famous cold war literary form. It contains no derogatory information.

The jacket blurb says that for the first time in history "an administration while still in office has permitted a distinguished journalist to compile an authentic, independent account of its conduct of affairs of state." But the closest Donovan ever comes to criticism of Eisenhower is when Senator Lister Hill discovers that Adolphe H. Wenzell of First Boston Corporation, financial agent for Dixon-Yates, had also been acting secretly as consultant to the Budget Bureau in preparing the government contract with his clients.

On the heels of this discovery, Eisenhower told the press Wenzell had "no connection at all with Dixon-Yates"; Haggerty had to "amplify" this blooper by saying that Wenzell had only given the Budget Bureau "technical advice" on the Dixon-Yates contract; and Budget Director Hughes had to spoil it all by testifying that Eisenhower knew all about Wenzell, "In fact he approved him before we got him down here. . . ." At this point in the story, Donovan's equanimity gives way and he sternly comments, "Things were mixed up for fair."

A Discreet and Cozy Bower

This sample shows Sherman Adams did not act recklessly last summer when he picked the White House correspondent of the New York *Herald-Tribune*, the country's leading pro-Eisenhower Republican paper, to prepare an election year account of the Eisenhower Administration. With New England caution, Adams also had him investigated by the FBI, and given a "Q" clearance. Thus certified as free from political impurity, Mr. Donovan was provided by the White House with an office and allowed access to its files, some of them anyway. In this cozy bower the Muse of History could not help becoming Sherman Adams's kept woman.

The by-blow of this summer romance is no Thucydides. But it is revealing. The Cabinet meeting minutes from which Donovan excerpts so fully and incautiously are often gems of

Mrs. Hobby and The Daily Worker

"When the [security] program was next discussed in the Cabinet on November 12, 1953, Mrs. Hobby complained that too much trivia sometimes appeared in the case reports of security officers. . . . In particular she cited statements such as that the person under investigation read the Daily Worker. Many people have to read the Worker as part of their jobs, she said."

—Robert J. Donovan: *The Inside Story*, p. 289.

unconscious humor. Here, for example, is a bit from the discussion which took place after Eisenhower read his Cabinet the first draft of his inaugural address. It deserves extended quotation as an early and intimate glimpse of the Administration's foremost minds at work. It shows Charlie Wilson's enthusiasm, John Foster Dulles's emphasis on the spiritual side of things, and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr.'s gift for incisive analysis. The President had just finished:

"You flew the flag" Wilson exclaimed. 'It was wonderful.'

"Dulles expressed his own concern that too much emphasis in the address was placed upon economics.

"But we must remember also today," Eisenhower countered, 'that unless we can put things in the hands of people

Brownell Hints at Secret Evidence on Rosenbergs

"The Attorney General [at a Cabinet meeting called to consider whether clemency should be granted the Rosenbergs] said that information which corroborated the guilt of the Rosenbergs was in possession of the government but that it could not have been used in the trial." —Robert J. Donovan: *The Inside Story*, p. 65.

who are starving to death, we can never lick Communism.'

"A picture he got of China, he said, was one of claws reaching out to grab anyone who looked as though he had five cents.

"I am convinced that we have got to do something about production," he said. 'Maybe I am wrong.'

It's Those Intellectuals Who Cause Trouble

"In India today," Dulles pointed out, 'the great peril of Communism comes from the intellectual centers.'

"The next to express his views was former Senator Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., who was to become the chief of the U. S. mission to the United Nations and who would, in that capacity, regularly attend meetings of the Cabinet. He objected to a reference to Moscow in the current draft as having been the center of autocracy and as being presently the center of revolution. Lodge felt that this implied that autocracy no longer reigned in Moscow, and beside, he said, lots of down-trodden people in the world would like to have a revolution.

"Despotism?" the President suggested. 'You are right.'

"If you give us a flip from autocracy to despotism," Wilson told [Emmet] Hughes [former *Life* editor, who had been hired as ghost writer], 'it would be better.'

"Finally, the passage was flipped out of the address altogether."

Even a Hollywood story conference is not more remorseless in its search for *le mot juste*.

II

In dealing with military matters, the President is down to earth but the Cabinet minutes show him starry-eyed in civilian affairs. During the review of the first State of the Union message, "Eisenhower declared that he wanted to work in . . . a strong passage about free enterprise which would help counteract the tendency, he said, of newspaper columnists to regard it as something opposed to humanitarianism and inimical to labor." Donovan's researches did not carry him far enough to discover where Ike learned that the papers were full of columns hostile to free enterprise.

Sometimes this idealism was too much for the President's closest associates. Preparing to address the Future Farmers of America, Eisenhower "wanted to deliver a purely inspirational type of address to the young farmers. That was what most youths would be interested in, he argued. . . . The President was stubborn but they finally persuaded him that young men and women on the farm have a lively interest in government agricultural policies. So he pitched in and defended Benson against his critics. . . ." It may be that in this case the President should have stuck to the inspirational.

Though the President attacked "creeping socialism," socialists seem to have no difficulty in creeping up on him. After a talk with Walter Reuther, Eisenhower informed the Cabinet he was impressed and "had detected none of the socialistic views he had heard attributed to Mr. Reuther." Norman Thomas was even more successful.

Ike and Dulles Clash

Norman Thomas called to protest Scott McLeod's statement that he would never clear a Socialist for a policy-making job. Eisenhower assured Thomas he had no doubt about the loyalty of Socialists. "Dulles," Donovan relates, "reminded the President that the Socialist Party platform had a

... And Got Himself An Election Year Account of Eisenhower

plank which, he said, equated capitalism with warmongering." But Eisenhower stood his ground, replying that the term Socialist had "taken on a very broad meaning and that some Socialists were in reality more conservative than some middle-of-the-roads."

On other aspects of Marxism, however, the President looks up to Dulles as a great scholar. Donovan reveals that Eisenhower "has recommended to associates that for a penetrating insight into Soviet philosophy they ought to have Dulles give them a 20-minute summary of Stalin's Problems of Leninism, something the President once listened to with admiration."

Though firmly briefed on Marxism-Leninism, the President sometimes has difficulty in understanding capitalism. "Following the silent prayer * at the meeting of the Cabinet on June 5," Donovan reports, "the President remarked that he needed spiritual help to preserve his disposition . . . it had come to his attention that the National Association of Manufacturers and the U. S. Chamber of Commerce had opposed extension of the excess profits tax."

A Subversive Remark in the Cabinet

Eisenhower complained to his Cabinet that "these business organizations . . . did not seem to realize that the middle-of-the-road course he was pursuing was the only one that gave them any chance of having a fair share of legitimate influence with the government." In trying to comfort him, two members of his official family verged almost on the subver-

Why Ike Kept Nixon

"The truth may lie somewhere along the line that Eisenhower was trying to keep the Vice-Presidential nomination open until Nixon's standing with the party could be tested, but that by April it was clear that his strength among regular Republicans was so firm that leaving him off the ticket would have been a difficult business."

—Robert J. Donovan: *The Inside Story*, p. 406

sive. "Taking a practical view," Donovan reports, "both Lodge and Benson observed that no stand taken by the Chamber or the NAM could do Eisenhower much harm." Lesser employees of the government have been rechecked for security after such remarks.

The President was often dismayed by the rightists, and like many generals in politics several times thought of forming a party of his own, a kind of American de Gaulist movement. "As he conceived it," Donovan relates, "such a party would have been essentially his party. . . . The President even went so far as to think of a name for it, but never hit upon one." From these "ruminations," Donovan tells us, originated "some of those celebrated phrases of his, like 'progressive moderates' . . . and 'dynamic conservatism.'"

Privately, we learn, Eisenhower went further Left in describing his own views. When Mrs. Hobby complained one day that the House Appropriations Committee had cut \$426,000 from Office of Education funds, "Eisenhower declared that every liberal—including myself—would take exception to this reduction." He declared that if the Cabinet did not object, "the administration [unlike Louis XIV, Ike never seems to talk as if the State were him] would take forthright action to have the funds restored." It is heartening to discover that "the Cabinet agreed." The liberals had won.

III

Eisenhower seems to have been less successful in impressing his foreign policy views on his Cabinet; in this sphere he

* Donovan discloses that Eisenhower adopted the idea of opening Cabinet meetings with a moment of silent prayer at the suggestion of Secretary of Agriculture Benson, perhaps as the member of the Cabinet most in need of divine guidance.

Why Ike Picked Warren

"The President was attracted by Warren's positions on certain questions of law and government . . . his opposition to Roosevelt's 'court packing' proposal, his indorsement of the Supreme Court decision in 1952 holding that Truman had exceeded his powers in seizing the strike-threatened steel industry, and his advocacy of state rather than Federal jurisdiction of the off shore oil lands."

—Robert J. Donovan: *"The Inside Story,"* p. 162

seems to have been overruled. At one of the very first Cabinet meetings we see Eisenhower arguing with Charlie Wilson for freer East-West trade.

"Remember this," the President is quoted as saying, "You are trying to set up out of Moscow what you might call a series of centrifugal forces. The last thing you can do is to begin to do things that force all these peripheral countries—the Baltic States, Poland, Czechoslovakia and the rest of them—to depend on Moscow for the rest of their lives." But Wilson objects that he himself is old-fashioned. "I don't like" Wilson says, "to sell firearms to the Indians." Eisenhower comes back at him, "How are you going to keep them interested in you? If you trade with them, Charlie, you have got something pulling their interest your way."

Left to himself, this book shows, the President would even be disposed to recognize Red China. This is Donovan's one major revelation. When Knowland and Taft were advocating a blockade of China, Eisenhower was telling a Cabinet meeting it would be "naive" to suppose that China could be defeated by blockade: "Instead, greatly to the detriment of the free world, he declared, it would compel China to rely to a greater extent on Russia for the products it needed."

From the minutes of a White House staff meeting in March, 1953, Donovan reports that the President "was not convinced" that American vital interests were served "by prolonged non-recognition of China." He asked whether it would not be the best policy "to try to pull China away from Russia rather than drive the Chinese ever deeper into an unnatural alliance unfriendly to the United States." He did not feel the moment had come for recognition but "he felt it was unfortunate that a climate had developed in which, so it seemed to him, it was looked upon almost as un-American even to debate the merits of recognition."

Kennanism at The White House?

Donovan does not notice the difference between this attitude and the high moral objections to co-existence of John Foster Dulles but he does record that Eisenhower at this same staff meeting "regretted that President Wilson had introduced a moral precedent [into the question of diplomatic recognition] in refusing in 1913 to recognize the revolutionary regime of President Victoriano Huerta in Mexico." This sound as if George Kennan, though ousted from the State Department, has been infiltrating the White House.

But the best the President has been able to do, as Donovan correctly reports it, has been to fight off Congressional riders which would have maneuvered him "into a rigid, uncompromising, unalterable position with respect to future relations with Red China." The difficulties were enormous. At one White House conference with Senators a "leader" [Knowland?] explained to the President that "the Senate was concerned . . . that if Red China could shoot its way into the UN, it might then shoot up the UN."

Acheson's metaphor about not letting the Chinese shoot their way in the UN had run wild. A pity no one suggested as a compromise that Communist China be admitted to the United Nations on condition that her delegates check their firearms in the outer lobby.

The Police State Machine to Create and Protect Informers

The Drive for More and More "Names" to Extend the Blacklist

(Continued from Page One)

detention camp jurisprudence, to which normal due process is inapplicable—how prove something which hasn't happened yet and may never happen?—was worth the most searching kind of discussion. It was passed over with question-begging truisms about reconciling liberty with security. *To reconcile oneself with the loss of liberty is not reconciling liberty with security.* How would these lawyers react if the SEC or the Federal Trade Commission or the Pure Food and Drug Administration decided to "reconcile liberty with security" by holding hearings in which accused corporations were not told just what they were being accused of doing, and denied—as Federal employees are denied—even a statement of *why* they have been found guilty?

But I must confess that after two days of immersion in the atmosphere of Washington I began to look upon the Bar Association report with more charitable eye. Weak and cautious as it was, the report was still braver than the prevailing attitudes of both parties. What are they waiting for—a joint demarche by the American Legion, the DAR and Cardinal Spellman against the security program before they pluck up enough courage to act?

A New National Institution

The past week had a nightmarish quality. Washington was dominated by the drive to make and protect informers. Arthur Miller was cited for contempt—because he refused to name "names." John Cogley was treated as some kind of a criminal by the House Un-American Activities Committee for daring to write that Fund for the Republic study of the whole ugly use made of "names" in blacklisting artists of all kinds who will not inform. No small part of the hysteria behind the drive for the Walter bill is the fear that without summary procedures for discharge the Courts may some day demand that informers be produced in ordinary Civil Service loyalty-suitability cases in non-sensitive positions.

Without discussion or hearings a bill (S. 374) has been reported to the Senate extending from three to six years the statute of limitations on false swearing by government employees

"with respect to subversive activities and connections." The excuse for this Eastland-Jenner bill (see Senate Report 2112) is that "it is sometimes necessary to defer prosecution beyond the present 3-year limitation until such time as identity of informants ceases to be of importance to the national security." (The Department of Justice through Deputy Attorney General William P. Rogers approved the idea of extending the statute of limitations to ten years; this was too much for the Senate Judiciary committee, which reduced it to six.) The Informer has become a major national institution, a major national concern.

The Only Word For It

The trouble with the Cogley study is that it failed, perhaps out of tact or timidity, to trace the blacklist to its real origins. This is in the work of the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and its allied organizations. Through its Committee on Socialism and Communism, the Chamber started out in 1946 to drive non-conformists of all kinds from entertainment and the professions. The blacklist was proposed by the Committee in its suggestions for "community action," a chrome-plated, more suave version of the vigilantism the country experienced in the early 20's. To discuss the problem weakly and defensively in terms of security and the Red menace is to accept the premises of the Chamber and the witch hunters. We have all been retreating so far on this issue that soon we will have no firm footing on which to stand.

The blacklist, the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the McCarran Internal Security Act (the old Mundt-Nixon bill), and the Smith Act can be understood only against the background of the Chamber of Commerce master plan. We need to recall that the U.S. C. of C. fathered all this legislation and engineered the Hollywood inquiry which launched the blacklist. The proof of this is available in any file of the annual reports made by the Chamber's Committee on Socialism and Communism. The objective of this program is permanently to fasten thought control on this country, a chrome plated American version of Fascism. It is time to use the word again—and to fight what it stands for.

Next Week: Philosopher Turns Informer—James Burnham Testifies Against The Independent Socialist League

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 301 E. Capitol, Wash. 3, D. C.
Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed \$5:

Name

Street

City Zone State

Enter gift sub for \$2 (6 mos.) or \$4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name 7/16/56

Street

City Zone State

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly

Room 205
301 E. Capitol St., S. E.
Washington 3, D. C.

NEWSPAPER

Entered as
Second Class Mail
Matter
Washington, D. C.
Post Office